

Tuesday, June 29th 2010

To Susan Carlson (Supervisor)

We, Cibeles Jolivette Gonzalez and Wenceslao Gonzalez Jr. , parents of Wenceslao Adonis Gonzalez III, and Galileo Basilio Gonzalez, are writing this letter in order to visibly express our disagreement with certain statements made, as well as to protest the decision made, to deny us study sessions with our sons.

First , we would like to state that we are mildly satisfied with at least the effort to appear to acknowledge our concerns, though it must be said that the belated nature of that acknowledgment, does not in any way seem to acknowledge the true importance of our views as parents, much less our rights.

It is, nevertheless, unfortunate that such a tardy response to our reasonable requests should embody a sugar coated effort to justify the continued violation of parental rights, through statements that are greatly inaccurate and misleading.

The only recollections that we have with regard to the appointment of an Educational Advocate are the following:

1) On the November 19th pre-trial, a DCYF lawyer requested that an Educational Advocate be assigned to our sons, a term which we, at the time, were totally unfamiliar with. No thought (as usual) was given to our views, and no value was placed on the lawful acquisition of our consent. We, at the time of the pre-trial, did not fully comprehend the implications of what was being proposed by DCYF, and did not know whether this course of action would be implemented in earnest without our consent, given the lack of due process, and the scanty “evidence” being used to prohibit us from educating our own children.

2) The receipt of a letter from DCYF much later, announcing this intention (without prior consultation with us). We responded to this letter with our own letter (dated January 21st 2010), stating our objection to the proposed measures, for it was then that we realized what the implications were.

3) The receipt of another letter from DCYF, acknowledging receipt of our January 21st 2010 letter, and then afterwards, a period of silence with regard to the final outcome of these intentions, leaving us with a question mark hanging over our long ignored concerns.

It is only now, in June 2010, that we are once again informed of something with regard to the Educational Advocate, though sadly in a misleading fashion. The court cannot order DCYF to request something. It is DCYF who makes requests of the Judge, who in turn decides whether they are granted or not.

Once again, we are forced by persistent yet unwelcome circumstances to state the irrationality of assuming that someone who is unfamiliar with the true origins of our children's present state, with how they were before, and their individual style of learning, can effectively help our children overcome delays in educational progress that were created by our sons' present foster parent.

When analyzed within the context of what the actual reality is, your agency's statements are contradictory, and devoid of rational significance. DCYF states that the Educational Advocate will oversee the "educational needs" of our children, and that educational plans have been developed to meet our sons' "educational needs". Yet all our efforts to address those needs (that only we are best qualified to assess), and to promote learning among our sons have been shunned and thwarted. So it would seem from what we have observed, that what your agency considers to be the "educational needs" of our children is for them

not to learn at all, and so continue to lag behind in areas where advancement had existed at one time, and which would have been reacquired if not for the inflexible and incomprehensible policies which DCYF chooses to enforce.

The evaluation results that are spoken of as a way of justifying those policies, are inaccurate, because of the traumatic circumstances under which they took place, the sheer illegalities present in their effectuation, and the motives of those closely involved in said process (our accusers).

Even the upcoming evaluation of our boys, which was proposed on the June 25th trial session cannot promise accurate and impartial results due to the continuing existence of the factors previously mentioned. We have extremely limited contact with our sons, and even more limited ability to influence them or to even educate them. The level of Parent Alienation that has been suffered, as well as the extremely long period of time for which this lunacy has dragged on, along with the environment in which they have passed that period of time, can only lead to evaluation results which are the product of artificially created situations that normally would not have existed.

“Thriving” and “trauma” are by nature antonyms in the real world, as one is the necessary ingredient for the cessation of the other. So how can any child thrive in any fashion, while in a traumatic environment?

Sadly, we live in a society of zero substance, upheld solely by the mirage of pure appearance, and so, many weary themselves proclaiming what they least do. It does not give us great joy to see that this tragic reality is so abundantly manifested in our unjust case. We are frankly tired of hearing so much sweet rhetoric on our children’s “well-being” and about their “educational needs”, when those are the things least being addressed, for the reasons which we have so frequently stated in the past, so as to become common

knowledge to all who are involved.

Your agency keeps speaking about the supposed gains that our sons are making in their current programs. We have yet to see the “gains” that are being spoken of. Are these “gains” of such a mysterious nature that they evade our observation on our bi-weekly visits? In order to have a correct understanding of whether or not gains in a child’s progress goals exist, one must have an accurate beforehand picture with which to truthfully compare. We had two years ago, a three and a half year old son who knew more than a first grader, now we have a five-year-old son who knows only a fraction of what he knew in 2008, and who does not seem as loving and as self-confident when it comes to learning or interacting. How can anyone possibly call that progress?!!

Is it really progress for our boys, or merely for the personal agenda of some?

Specialized educators are of little avail, when they fail to grasp the bizarre, yet complex factors that fuel the motives of those who have created this situation, and who have infinitely more opportunity to influence our sons’ behavior, thus affecting their ability to learn. Specific instructional practices must be tailored to specific circumstances, and possess an in depth understanding of the specific style with which each child learns, according to their unique personality. Since one cannot tailor instructional practices to ignored circumstances, nor understand a child’s unique approach to learning, when one lacks knowledge of how that child learned prior to his trauma-induced delays, any proclaimed efforts are therefore condemned to futility.

We have taught our son in the past with successful results, and are well acquainted with how he learns. Both of us have experience teaching children, and with our own children have invested heavily in educational toys, DVDs, and books, yet it has been implied during our last visit that we need an evaluation to perhaps teach our children!

Sadly, no one thinks that our accuser needs an evaluation before having custody of our boys! It is precisely this partiality which contributes to the reluctance of many to see what is going on, and makes it virtually impossible to address, much less identify areas of need, for our boys.

We do not fully understand what your agency perceives to be “functional communication skills”. Trauma causes in very small children (in most cases) a regression in speech, as well as in other areas, especially in boys, who due to normal brain differences, tend to be less verbally expressive than girls. We do not expect any improvement in this area when two little boys are shuffled back and forth from an unloving home to a daycare center where they spend a greater part of the day. Since all functions need an impetus to motivate it’s continuance, it is safe to assume that certain functional behaviors and skills must be carefully nurtured, which in our sons’ present environment would prove difficult. Lack of positive nurturing can only nurture dysfunctionality, which is what we are striving so fervently to prevent in our sons’ lives, despite the constant intervention of others.

The statement made, saying that our sons have been taught “play skills related to the functional use of toys” seems to be an unnecessary exercise in eloquent phrases that bear no true meaning. All children intuitively know how to play, and each has a distinct approach to play, that is partly shaped by example, and partly by personality.

Our eldest child played with some educational toys that were meant for older children due to his precocious pre-trauma literary skills. Even Galileo was beginning to scribble on his brother’s drawing board when he was taken away.

All children know how to play. The role of the parent is to guide that play toward positive and productive goals (such as learning), while avoiding toys that can corrupt those natural play skills by promoting negative attributes in the child, such as occurs with violent toys and video games.

Since our babies only played with educational toys or stuffed animals (prior to this situation), this threat to their moral development was absent from their play world.

We are disappointed that DCYF reasoning has reached the stage, where it is felt that to justify the unwelcome enforcement of unnecessary services, our children must be deprived in the view of others, of skills that they have always possessed. Eloquence is only as attractive as the profundity of what it seeks to clarify. The only functional use for toys is that of developmental exploration to aid in perpetual learning.

Each child explores according to their stage of development in their constant efforts to learn. Whether what they learn through play is negative or positive depends on the toys provided to the child, as well as the environment in which the child is in.

Play should be used as a foundation for promoting a lifelong love of learning. If the child is given only educational toys, learning will become enjoyable, and that attitude will influence them for the rest of their lives. How a child uses a toy at first (as long as the toy is not hazardous) is not really important, for it is through hands on exploration that the child figures out the popularly assigned function of a specific toy. So to say that a child needs therapy, or any other type of “service” to play with a toy, is both worrisome and indignating to us.

It is also sad that your agency fails to understand that if a child receives no love where they are living at, it will inevitably affect to a certain degree their interaction with others.

Emphasis on teaching children who have never been to school, to follow classroom routines is not rational when areas of greater importance are being carelessly overlooked, such as promoting a love of learning necessary for academic achievement, and teaching the child basic, yet necessary curriculum to give him a head start in school. The term “classroom routines” seems to be excessively ambiguous, but nevertheless is assumed by us to mean etiquette which governs classroom behavior, such as sitting at a desk, standing in

line, and similar rules. Yet it is the child's capacity and willingness to learn that is of prime importance in any classroom setting, regardless of grade level.

So why have our efforts to aid in this crucial function been thwarted?

Of what use is it for a child to know how to stand in line when he cannot read, and is too traumatized to learn effectively?

We find it highly ironic that an Educational Advocate has been appointed in an attempt to impede parents who highly value education from educating their own children, and that agencies who claim to place so much emphasis on families "well-being" are partial and supportive of our accusers, who in reality wish to destroy our family.

In our January 21st letter, we described in detail the usual circumstances that exist, as well as the procedures used, when appointing an advocate, none of which are applicable to our situation. We have met with Mr. Eh---, the coordinator of CASEY Family Services, though we are aware that their agency's actions are dictated by DCYF decisions.

Nevertheless, we hope that the promise of participation on the part of DCYF is sincere. Participation is an interactive process, and it is a degree of autonomy that enhances that interactive nature. If we are to just sit, and listen to what is being proposed in order to only nod compliantly, and so have no real opportunity to make decisions for our sons, then the participation that is being suggested is a sham, as unfortunately so much pertaining to this absurd case is.

We also hope that this move to CASEY is not an attempt on the part of DCYF to distance themselves (in appearance) from the influence that they will still continue to exert over other agencies, as well as the decisions which they make.

We are open to civilized and fair dialogue, as long as it is conducive towards actual progress, rather than a further deterioration of our already long beleaguered rights.

Last, but not least, we would like for DCYF to please stop seeking imaginary needs for our family, while ignoring the one real need that we have always had:

To live our lives in peace with our children, preferably far away from those who have sought to destroy our marriage for six years, and who stubbornly refuse to follow the advice of “Live, and let live.”

We will still anticipate some degree of cooperation in the near future, if such an unlikely prospect still seems somewhat possible. We may agree to disagree, but we cannot agree to consent to measures that may cause long-term jeopardy to our sons’ genuine well-being and self-esteem.

Sincerely,